UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,652	04/16/2004	Johannes Bechtold	07781.0167	8478

22852   7590   07/29/2009
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 July 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/13/2009 has been entered.

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 6/18/2009.

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. In the Amendment 1, 6, 7, 10, 13, 18, 20, 21-

22, and 25-36 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention. The claims recite the limitation of "the non-pattern based user interface being

developed by editing a source code of the non-pattern based user interface." The limitation is

not clearly described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes (U.S.

Pat. No. 6,275,223), and Molina-Moreno et al ("Molina-Molina", US 7,334,216)

Per claim 1, Hughes teaches a computer-implemented method for providing a user-

interface, the method comprising:

providing an application including a pattern based user interface for displaying, using a

processor, a data object and for receiving a first input from the user, the first input comprising

selection of the data object displayed within a pattern based user interface (figs. 7, 15 and 17;

which show menu tool bar 701 with data objects (e.g. "help", "File", "Source" or "timer" object)

follow a pattern because the menu tool bar 701 is positioned in the same area. In addition, the

system receive user inputs in response to user's selections of the items on the menu tool bar, see

col. 10, lines 37-45) and

providing within the application a non-pattern based user interface, at least for displaying

data, in response to the first input, (figs. 7, and 17; *which show the source code display area*

702, 703 and 1701 have different patterns (e.g. a pair of source codes or a single source code is

displayed. In addition, the source codes are displayed in response to user's selections of the

items on the menu tool bar, see col. 10, lines 37-45).

Wherein the pattern based user interface and the non-pattern based user interface are

displayed together in a window (figs. 7, 15, and 17)

Hughes does not specifically teach in developing a graphical user interface, the pattern

user interface being developed by reusing user interface components, displaying sub-object

attribute data of a data object, the non-pattern user interface being developed by editing a source

code of the non-pattern based user interface, receiving in the non pattern user interface, a second

input from the user to change a position of at least one element of the sub-object attribute data

displayed in the non-pattern based user interface, and a pattern based user interface provides

general information of the data object and the non-pattern base user interface provides detail

information of the data object in the form of the sub-object attribute data.

However, Molina-Moreno teaches a well-known method for building a functional user

interface comprising the pattern user interface being developed by reusing user interface

components (col. 4, lines 12-50; col. 5, lines 53-62; col. 10, lines 35-40; *which shows utilizing*

patterns as building blocks used to define a user interface) , displaying sub-object attribute data

of a data object, the non-pattern user interface being developed by editing a source code of the

non-pattern based user interface (col. 4, line 55-col. 5, lines 38; col. 5, lines 62-67; *which shows*

editing a model to change a model thereby easily changing the resulting code which ultimately

be generated from the model. By editing the model (i.e. the pattern), the model is being

considered as a non-pattern user interface), receiving in the non pattern user interface, a second

input from the user to change a position of at least one element of the sub-object attribute data

displayed in the non-pattern based user interface(col. 4, line 55-col. 5, lines 38; col. 5, lines 62-

67; col. 6, lines 19-42), and a pattern based user interface provides general information of the

data object and the non-pattern base user interface provides detail information of the data object

in the form of the sub-object attribute data (figs. 11 and 24; col. 4, lines 3-12; col. 15, lines 24-

37; col. 30, lines 12-22.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to include the teaching of Molina-Moreno in the invention of Hughes in order to

provide an environment for building a graphical user interface for business applications and

information system and to simplify and speed up the process of writing computer code which

implements user interfaces for business and other application program (see col. 2, lines 50-55.)

Per claim 2, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising displaying business sub-object attribute data of at least two business objects

within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, figs. 15; *source code object*

"Demonstration.c.1.1" and "Demonstration.c.1.2"; col. 11, lines 55-67).

Per claim 3, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising displaying business sub-object attribute data of at least two business objects

on a side-by-side basis within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 15; *side by side*

display of areas 1501, and 1502; col. 12, lines 23-27).

Per claim 4, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising providing the non-pattern based user interface within at least one frame

separated from the pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 5; col. 12, lines 23-27; *areas 1501*

and 1502 are at least one frame separated from the toolbar area).

Per claim 5, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising providing general information of business objects within the pattern based

user interface and providing detail information of the business objects within the non-pattern

based user interface (Hughes, figs. 7 and 8; col.. 10, lines 38-58; col. 11, lines 55-67; *detail*

information is displayed in area 1501 and 1502 of fig. 15).

Per claim 6, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising providing markup-language style sheets for developing the non-pattern based

user interface (Hughes, fig. 22; col. 10, lines 1-12, and lines 17-22; Molina-Moreno, col. 7, lines

12-20; col. 18, lines 12-18).

Per claim 7, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising providing the pattern based user interface for all windows within the

application (Hughes, figs. 7-10, 15, and 17; toolbar area).

Per claim 8, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

wherein the pattern based user interface is defined within the application on different hierarchy

levels (Hughes, figs. 7 and 8; *toolbar area 701; first level "file menu", and second level drop*

down menu display 800).

Per claim 9, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising defining combinations of the predefined user interface components within the

pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 7; col. 9, lines 5-17; *combination of user interface*

components are defined during software development of the application; Molina-Molreno, col. 4,

lines 12-24*).*

Per claim 10, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 9,

further comprising defining the relative position or absolute positions of the predefined user

interface components within the pattern based user interface (Hughes, col. 9, lines 5-17; *relative*

and/or absolute position are defined during software development of the application)

Per claim 11, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising providing at least one of text, file directories, graphics, and multimedia

content within the non-pattern based user interface (Hughes, fig. 15; *area 1501, and 1502).*

Per claim 12, the modified Hughes teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1,

further comprising changing the appearance of the non-pattern based user interface based on the

displayed data (Hughes, fig. 15; *source code display area 1501 and 1502 are displayed based on*

user selection, see col. 11, lines 55-65).

Claims 13-24 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-12 respectively.

Claims 25-36 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-12 respectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amendment have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THANH T. VU whose telephone number is (571)272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L. Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thanh T. Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175